Learning Conversation Notes	
Name of Partner:	Date: 02-28-2005
Golden Sierra Life Skills-Men, Infants, and	
Children (MIC) Program	
Number of Children Served:	Ages:
3 Kings Beach	KB: 1 1yr Auburn: 0 yr 5
26 Auburn	1 3yr 1 yr 2
	1 5yr 2 yr 7
	3 yr 8
	4 yr 2
	5 yr 2
When Served:	Gender: Ethnicity:
November 2004 To Present	Kings Beach
	3 Males 3 Latino
	Auburn
	15 M 18 Caucasian
	11 F 7 Latino
	1 Other/Asian

Conversation Participants:

Don Ferretti, Nancy Baggett, Kim Bradley, Tom Grayson, Tamara Lieberman, Deborah Dahl, Cesar Acosta, Heidi Kolbe – Facilitator, Diane Bras

Outcomes:

- Fathers and father figures are more knowledgeable in child nurturing, child interacting, and parenting, and use these skills to promote their child's appropriate development.
- Financial sustainability for the MIC Program independent of First 5 funding.

Performance Measures:

- Demographics (number of 0-5 served by gender, age, ethnicity, and when services were provided).
- Placer Early Childhood Outcomes Screens
- Survey of father/father figures change in knowledge of child development, parenting, and their relationship with their children.
- Grant applications submitted, and funding received to enhance and sustain the MIC program independent of First 5 funding

What is this data telling us about achievement of outcomes? Kings Beach

- 1. Outreach was hampered by the loss of the outreach person. Kim and Family Resource Center will be instrumental in getting information to the community. Outreach is a main component for the success of this program
- 2. Outcomes did not reveal any changes in the children screened as these children did not come from at risk environments (not referred by the courts or family services)
- 3. Consistency in the program affects the ability for the program to really impact the children. Weather has been a contributing factor in attendance. Offering this class in the winter may not be a great idea
- 4. Indicators 17-20 are focused on the parent/caregiver, and the child information is gleaned from information provided by this person. This would indicate that the information may not be entirely accurate. Also the assessment period of 49 days is not long enough to result in real improvement
- 5. Need to target programs that would require men to attend the program as a part of probation as another way to reach out in the community

<u>Auburn</u>

- 1. Brain development information is emphasized with behavioral modeling and videos.
- 2. Referrals come from WIC, High Conflict court, Family Court Facilitators Office, Chana, and galleria events.
- 3. Indicator 10 (emotional development) MIC views this more from the perspective of the parents. Education has resulted in behavior modification improving the entire family dynamic
- 4. Ind. 17. If fathers have more support, they are more able to use the education from MIC and modify their behavior. For example, the father was able to communicate with the child instead of resorting to corporal punishment
- 5. Indicator 19: 24 of 26 children were working towards or achieving this outcome. At exit all the children were achieving this outcome.
- 6. The families represented by this data were mostly in good shape. There was only one family in crisis, and this dad is not in the home.

Auburn Survey

- 1. There was 100% parent participation in the survey, both English and Latino.
- 2. Simple questions allowed for more voluntary responses that were then expanded upon.
- 3. All six Latino fathers felt that the program improved their image as a father figure
- 4. Most felt that the relationship with their child had improved after attending the program
- 5. One dad felt that he has become more responsible.
- 6. The Latino facilitator, Carlos, lives in the community and witnesses some of the improvements, and some fathers bring children to the classes
- 7. The fact the fathers are identifying with points in the program suggests that the fathers are aware of good communication skills and that awareness will make them more apt to use those skills

Regarding sustainability, MIC has begun billing fathers/agencies with children 6 and over. Partnership with March of Dime, and UC Medical Services for materials. Meeting with other groups in the community for funding.

See attachment for more information

In what ways will we apply what we have learned from our data?

- 1. Parent comments are good indicators of the program's success, but there needs to be a more consistent method for collecting this data
- 2. If MIC is going to use the anecdotes, then MIC should use the anecdote collection system that Mike developed

Other points that were made during the conversation:

- 1. Survey questions were modified to more clearly address the outcome screens with clarification coming from a more in depth interview. The outcome screen is completed after this interview
- 2. Whatever data is collected should always go back to the outcomes
- 3. Ask the question "What are you doing differently now, after having attended the program

Next Steps:

- 1. Consider Cesar completing the outcome screens and administering the surveys
- 2. Record whether the dads represented in the data are in the home or not
- 3. Consult with other partners to determine if the entry survey questions are appropriate and lead to the indicator
- 4. Look for descriptors that would provide mental pictures for the indicators.
- 5. Mike will look for the descriptors that link to the outcome screens
- 6. Really need to recruit for the outreach person in Kings Beach
- 7. Refine the data collection and surveys to get at the data speaking to the outcomes
- 8. Consider the appropriateness of the outcome screens. There may be more appropriate tools
- 9. Next learning conversation to occur in Kings Beach August 05